



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/695,252

10/27/2003

Norman C. Fawley

599 10P003

4350

8791 7590 09/04/2009

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040

EXAMINER

BUTLER, PATRICK NEAL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1791

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/04/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/695,252	FAWLEY, NORMAN C.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CHRISTINA JOHNSON	1791	

All Participants:

(1) CHRISTINA JOHNSON.

(2) Olivia Tsai.

Status of Application: After Final

(3) Dimitri Krimis.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 1 September 2009

Time: ____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

112, first

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Christina Johnson/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: In a telephon conversation, SPE Johnson proposed amending the independent claim as follows:

1.(Proposed) A method of bending Composite Reinforced Pipe (CRP)comprising:

placing a heater proximate to one of a plurality of longitudinally displaced locations along the pipe where the pipe is to be bent, the pipe having a composite reinforcement comprising a resin and reinforcement fibers coupled thereto;
heating the pipe to a temperature above a heat distortion temperature of the resin such that the composite reinforcement is heated to a temperature below a heat distortion temperature of the composite reinforcement;
advancing the pipe to a bending location;

and

incrementally bending the pipe [incrementally] at one [each] of the plurality of heated, longitudinally displaced locations, the longitudinally displaced locations separated by a distance equal to approximately $\frac{1}{4}$ of a diameter of the pipe.

SPE Johnson indicated that if applicant were to adopt such an amendment after final, this amendment would be entered and would overcome the 112 first paragraph rejection. A statement as to how the amended claim would be addressed over the prior art of record would be provided in an advisory action..